

REMARKS

1. Status of Claims

Claims 1 – 25 were previously cancelled. Claims 29, 39, and 49 are cancelled herein. Claims 26 – 28, 30 – 38, 40 – 48, and 50 – 58 are pending. Claims 26, 30, 36, 40, 46, 50, and 56 – 58 are amended. These amendments are supported throughout the specification and original claims. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

All amendments and cancellations presented herein are made solely to expedite prosecution of the application without admission as to the propriety of the rejections set forth in any Office Action or Board Decision and without acquiescence to the Examiner's or Board's characterization of the claims or the art cited herein. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to include claims of the same or different scope as previously written in one or more continuing applications.

2. Information Disclosure

Applicants would like to make the Examiner aware of the Office Actions dated January 25, 2010 and July 19, 2010 in co-pending Application Serial No. 11/980,577; and the Official Actions dated October 8, 2008, April 15, 2009, January 20, 2010, and July 21, 2010 in co-pending Application Serial No. 11/980,576.

3. Claim Rejections

Claims 26-33, 36-43, 46-53 and 56 – 58 stand rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0033212 to Sandhu ("Sandhu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,024,462 to McErlean ("McErlean"). Claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 stand

rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sandhu in view of McErlean and Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Claim 26, as amended, requires one or more client devices operable to receive *by way of entry into an interface* information concerning one or more deals, the one or more deals each comprising a financial transaction *that has been agreed to by a party and a counterparty*. Similarly, claims 36 and 46, as amended, each require receiving from one or more client devices information concerning one or more deals, the received information being *entered by one or more users into an interface* displayed by the client devices, wherein the one or more deals each comprise a financial transaction *that has been agreed to by a party and a counterparty*. Sandhu does not disclose, at least, these limitations. Sandhu discloses interfaces that receive information regarding *price requests* and *price quotes* (see, e.g., Sandhu, paras. [0197], [0985]), not *deals comprising a financial transaction that has been agreed to by a party and a counterparty*, as claimed. While Sandhu makes reference to the fact that the party making the price request and the party making the price quote may indeed reach an agreement (e.g., Sandhu, para. [0197]), Sandhu does not disclose *any interface for capturing information regarding such agreed upon transactions*, as required by claims 26 and 36.

McErlean does not make up for the deficiency in Sandhu in this regard and, thus, claims 26, 36 and 46 are patentable over Sandhu and McErlean, alone or in combination. Dependent claims 27, 28, 30 – 35 and 56 depend from independent claim 26, thereby incorporating all the features of this base claim. Dependent claims 37, 38, 40 – 45 and 57 depend from independent claim 36, thereby incorporating all the features of this base claim. Dependent claims 47, 48, 50 –

55 and 58 depend from independent claim 46, thereby incorporating all the features of this base claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit Sandhu and McErlean, alone or in combination, fail to teach the features of these dependent claims for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, Sandhu and McErlean fail to disclose the specific elements required by the dependent claims, an example of which is described below.

For example, each of claims 56, 57 and 58 require that the information is routed to at least one of the plurality of internal systems, each of the plurality of internal systems being configured to process a designated product type. Neither Sandhu nor McErlean disclose this feature.

Sandhu states in paragraph [0930]:

The functionality provided by the present embodiment of this invention enables user to conduct interactive and automated financial transactions in capital markets. The types of transactions that may be conducted are described above. The functionality and interactive user interfaces that support the creation and execution of such transactions enable users to engage in pre-transaction, transaction, and post-transaction activities. Note that the functionality and interfaces described in this embodiment could be combined with other functionality and interfaces, or certain of such functionality and interfaces (or portions thereof) could be isolated in separate systems, in various other embodiments of this invention. The system can be implemented as a stand-alone central system or as a distributed system, with separate versions of the functionality and interfaces distributed to multiple user platforms or portals. In other embodiments, portions of the system functionality and interfaces could be divided into separate systems (e.g., a transaction structuring system, a price quote system, a transaction acceptance system) with communication links that enable the different systems to exchange data. Other embodiments will be apparent to and could be implemented by practitioners skilled in this art.

Thus, Sandhu describes that its system may be implemented (1) as a stand-alone central system; (2) as a distributed system, with separate versions of the functionality and interfaces

distributed to multiple user platforms or portals; or (3) by dividing the functionality and interfaces into separate systems. As to embodiment (3) of Sandhu, Sandhu makes clear that, by referring to use of separate systems for “functionality and interfaces”, it is referring to the various *tasks* that are undertaken by the system and not *product types* that could be handled by the system. In particular, Sandhu uses the term “functionality”, which does not in any way refer to product types, and, further, Sandhu provides examples of the “functionality” to which it refers (“e.g., a transaction structuring system, a price quote system, a transaction acceptance system”). Thus, Sandhu neither teaches nor suggests that each of the plurality of internal systems is configured to process a designated product type as required by the claims. McErlean does not make up for this deficiency.

For at least the above-cited reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Please charge the fee for the Request for Continued Examination, and any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: November 22, 2010

By: /Alison B. Weisberg/
Alison B. Weisberg
Reg. No. 45,206

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Customer No.: 28977
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19003
Telephone: 215.963.5091